

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| ARGUMENT | 3 |
| CROSS –EXCEPTIONS 1, 8-10..... | 3 |
| I. THE CGC’S CROSS- EXCEPTIONS SHOULD BE DENIED AS THE EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT MTC DID NOT VIOLATE SECTION 8(A)(1) WHEN, DURING AN INVESTIGATION OF MS. REBARCHAK’S GRIEVANCE. MTC REQUIRED MS. REBARCHAK TO PROVIDE A TRUTHFUL WRITTEN STATEMENT REGARDING THE EVENTS OF THE INCIDENT BECAUSE | 3-4 |
| a. The evidence shows that the CGC cross-exceptions are without merits as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) by requiring Ms. Rebarchak to give a truthful written statement regarding the events of the incident as per section 8(b)(3), as the union has a duty to provide MTC information in the context of grievance handling..... | 4 |
| b. The evidence is clear that the CGC’s cross-exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) by requiring Ms. Rebarchak to give a truthful written statement regarding the events of the incident as per the CBA and the law, MTC’s actions were necessary as it has the “Just Cause” burden of proof | 10 |
| c. The evidence shows that the CGC’s cross-exceptions are without merit because MTC did not violate Section 8(a)(1) when, during an investigation of Ms. Rebarchak’s grievance, MTC required Ms. Rebarchak to provide a truthful written statement regarding the events of the incident because as per the CBA, Ms. Rebarchak has a duty to be subordinate and truthful | 14 |
| CROSS – EXCEPTIONS 5 | 16 |
| CROSS – EXCEPTIONS 2-4, 6-7, 11-17..... | 16 |
| II. THE CGC’S CROSS-EXCEPTIONS 2-4,6-7 AND 11-17 ARE WITHOUT MERIT BECAUSE THE COMPANY DID NOT REFUSE TO PROVIDE, AND /OR UNREASONABLY DELAY IN PROVIDING, RELEVANT AND NECESSARY INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE UNION ON JUNE 29,2012 BECAUSE | 17 |
| a. The evidence is clear that the CGC cross-Exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) nor section 5 in relation to the union’s June 29, 2012 information request because MTC provided the majority of the information requested on June 29, 2012, prior to the union’s written request of June 29, 2012 | 17 |
| b. The evidence is clear that the CGC’s Cross- Exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) nor section 5 in relation to the union’s June 29, 2012, information request as the majority of information requested by the union was irrelevant. | 19 |
| B1. The evidence is clear that the CGC cross-exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) nor section 5 in relation to the union’s June 29, 2012, information request as the majority of information requested by the union was irrelevant because the company never made any claims in its bargaining proposals to make the information request relevant | |

| | |
|--|----|
| B2. The evidence is clear that the CGC cross- exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) nor section 5 in relation to the union’s june 29, 2012, information request as the union sought wages and information as to non-bargaining unit employees | 24 |
| B3. The evidence is clear that the CGC cross-exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) nor section 5 in relation to the union’s June 29, 2012, information request as the union sought proprietary and confidential information. | 26 |
| C1. The evidence is clear that the CGC cross-exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) nor section 5 in relation to the union’s June 29, 2012, information request as there was no unreasonable delay because the union admitted that the company had previous responded to most of the request. | 30 |
| C2. The evidence is clear that the CGC cross-exceptions are without merit as MTC did not violate section 8(a)(1) nor section 5 in relation to the union’s June 29, 2012, information request as there was no unreasonable delay because the union never responded to the company’s claim that the information was irrelevant. | 30 |
| CROSS – EXCEPTION 18 | 33 |
| CROSS – EXCEPTION 19 | 33 |